

A POSTSCRIPT ON NICOLAS CABASILAS' "ANTI-ZEALOT" DISCOURSE

IHOR ŠEVČENKO

I

IN the commentary to the edition of Nicolas Cabasilas' "Anti-Zealot" *Discourse* (*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 11 [1957], 79–171), I made one main point and offered one main suggestion. The point was that the *Discourse* had nothing to do with the program of the Zealots, the famous social revolutionaries of Thessalonica (1342–1349), but was concerned—in addition to other matters ecclesiastical in nature—with the secularization of monastic property by the Byzantine government for purposes of defense. I even stated that Cabasilas' text should be eliminated from the Zealot *dossier*.

The suggestion was that the lay adversaries attacked by Cabasilas were the Loyalist authorities in Constantinople during the forties of the fourteenth century, in particular Alexius Apocaucus (d. July 11, 1345). As for the mystic's ecclesiastical adversaries, I hesitated between Hyacinthus, Metropolitan of Thessalonica (?–1346) and Patriarch John Calecas (1334–1347). On the strength of this suggestion, I proposed the year 1344 as the probable date of the *Discourse*.

In his review of *DOP*, 11, J. Gill stated that my conclusion would "meet with general acceptance."¹ Alas, he was too optimistic. True, among reviewers, many accepted my findings,² though some with reservations,³ and others reported them without comment.⁴ Among authors of recent monographs, G. T. Dennis found that I demonstrated my main point "without leaving the slightest doubt,"⁵ while G. I.

Theocharides kindly incorporated my results into his narrative.⁶ This, however, was only one side of the picture. In a number of other reviews and articles, my findings, if considered at all, were declared to be either inconclusive, or completely wrong. G. L. Seidler,⁷ the author of a monograph on social thought in Byzantium, discussed the Zealot program on the basis of Cabasilas' work without any reference to the fact that the problem had been reopened. V. Hrochová,⁸ who had a few kind words to say on my presentation and technique, was of two minds. Once she described my main contention as the incontestably positive result of my analysis. In the next sentence, however, she found that by considering Apocaucus as Cabasilas' target, I contradicted myself (presumably since, in her opinion, the Zealots were only the most radical of Apocaucus' supporters). Even if my thesis were accepted, the proposition that the Zealot program was social in character was not refuted.⁹ This was fair enough. Others, however, flatly opposed my reinterpretation and proclaimed that Cabasilas did write specifically against the Zealots and their "Zealotic" archbishop.

In the course of his refutation, E. Werner¹⁰

⁶ Τοπογραφία καὶ πολιτικὴ ἱστορία τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης κατὰ τὸν 14' αἰῶνα (1959) [= 'Εταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, "Ἰδρυμα μελετῶν Χερσονήσου τοῦ Αἴμου, nr. 31], 41.

⁷ *Soziale Ideen in Byzanz* (1960) [= *Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten*, Band 24], 41–42.

⁸ Reviews: *Československý časopis Historický*, 7 (1959), 372; *Byzantinoslavica*, 20 (1959), 91–95. Articles: "Povstání Zeloťů v Soluni a jeho sociální předpoklady," *Československý časopis Historický*, 7 (1959), 405–427; "La révolte des Zélotes à Salonique et les communes italiennes," *Byzantinoslavica*, 22 (1961), 1–15.

⁹ *Byzantinoslavica*, 20 (1959), 94; cf. *Byzantinoslavica*, 22 (1961), 10–11 and note 54.

¹⁰ "Volkstümliche Häretiker oder sozialpolitische Reformen? Probleme der revolutionären Volksbewegung in Thessalonike 1342–1349," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig*, 8 (1958/59), Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe,

¹ *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 24 (1958), 232.

² J. M. Hussey in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 10 (1959), 415 and others.

³ P. Charanis in *Speculum*, 33 (1958), 393–394.

⁴ F. Dölger in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 51 (1958), 190.

⁵ *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387* (1960) [= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 159], 23.

observed that only with class analysis as a point of departure could one make a just appraisal of the Zealot commune. E. Frances¹¹ summed up his rebuttal by saying that my erroneous thesis followed the method of some of my American colleagues who attempt to minimize those movements in the life of mankind where the masses take destiny into their own hands and thereby inscribe glorious pages into the book of history.

Quite recently a Cypriote scholar sought to smooth over this dichotomy of views: In his article, Mr. K. P. Kyrrhis¹² proposed a compromise solution: Cabasilas, he thought, inveighed against both Apocausus and the Zealots, against both Hyacinthus and John Calecas.

After careful perusal of the statements by authors who continue to connect Cabasilas' *Discourse* with the Zealots, either in part or entirely, I wish to state the following:

1. Cabasilas' anonymous adversaries secularized monastic property (the land or its revenue) presumably to provide sustenance for soldiers, to repair walls, and to build ships. Not a single piece of *bona fide* evidence was proffered in the discussion to show that the Zealots did any of these things. All the statements to the contrary were based on surmises, circular argument (that is, references to Cabasilas or to modern authors who relied on him), or—I must say the harsh words—on misleading quotations.

2. No passage in Cabasilas' *Discourse* has a reasonably close counterpart in any source expressly referring to the Zealots.¹³ All at-

tempts to draw such parallels or to interpret any part of the *Discourse* in a "Zealotic" sense were based on circular arguments, on mistranslations, and on misunderstood quotations.¹⁴

3. Precision was not prominently displayed in the discussion. Thus one critic¹⁵ (in the course of a three-page rebuttal) abstained altogether from stating that I had edited the *Discourse* and construed my conclusions to be that the Zealotic events "did not in fact mean the revolutionary battle of popular masses." Another critic¹⁶ reproached me for not juxtaposing Cabasilas' text with other sources bearing on the Zealots and for leaving out of consideration the fact that Cabasilas was a scion of a rich Thessalonican family.

other Byzantine texts, particularly those dealing with the confiscation of monastic property for military purposes. I may add, in passing, that even *Discourse* 6, 2-14, into which Tafrali (*Thessalonique au XIV^e siècle* [1912], 265 and note 3) and his followers read the "Zealotic" maxim *salus populi suprema lex esto*, finds its parallel in the phrases of Theodore Metochites, expounding, of all things, the theory of the aristocratic form of government. Compare *Discourse*, 6, 2-3 and 12-14, χρήναι, φασί, τοὺς ἐπιμελητὰς τῶν κοινῶν πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ λυσιτελεῖν ὁρῶντας πάντα ποιεῖν δεῖ τοὺς κοινούς ἐπιτρόπους, οὓς εἶναι χρὴ νομίσαι τοὺς ἀρχοντας, καὶ βουλομένων καὶ μὴ τοῖς αὐτῶν ὁ, τι βέλτιόν ἐστι χρῆσθαι, κἂν ἀποπηδῶσιν ἐκεῖνοι κἂν ὀδύρωνται, καθάπερ μικρὰ παιδία περιορᾶν, with Metochites' *Miscellanea*, ed. Müller-Kießling (1821), 620-621: κἂν εἰ ἄρα τοῖς γε πολιτικοῖς τούτοις (i.e. aristocratic politicians) καὶ βία τις ἐκάστοτε κατὰ χρεῖαν ἀπαντῆσαι κατὰ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ἀμαθίας . . . τῷ παντὶ βέλτιον ἂν εἴη, καὶ νόμοι φύσεως οὗτοι κρατοῦσι παντὶ τρόπῳ, καὶ ἐκόντων τε καὶ ἀκόντων τῶν πλείστων τὰ διαφέροντα σφίσι καὶ κατὰ χρεῖαν λυσιτελῇ νομίζειν τε καὶ δι' ἐπιμελείας ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς τὴν ἡγεμονικὴν προνομίαν ἀριστίνδην λαχόντας. This parallel does not mean that Cabasilas' adversaries were aristocrats. It means that the Byzantines adored clichés, and that against these their modern interpreters should be on constant guard.

¹⁴ To substantiate the statements made in points 1 and 2 would be unprofitable or embarrassing.

¹⁵ E. Frances, "Răscoala . . ." (as in note 11 *supra*), and 263.

¹⁶ E. Werner, "Volkstümliche Häretiker . . ." (as in note 10 *supra*), 46, note 8. For the first objection, cf. point 2 *supra* and *DOP* 11 (1957), 84, 151, 160, 164, 166; for the second, cf. *ibidem*, 85 (which Werner even quotes) and 169-170.

Heft 1, 45-83, esp. 45-69 and note 8; "Narodnaja eres' ili dvizhenie za social'nopolitičeskie reformy? Problemy revoljucionnogo dvizhenija v Soluni v 1342-1349 gg.," *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 17 (1960), 155-202. The German version is the fuller one of the two. H.-G. Beck, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 53 (1960), 220-221 tentatively sided with E. Werner's refutation.

¹¹ "Răscoala Zeloților din Thessalonica în lumina ultimelor cercetări," *Academia Republicii Populare Române, Subsecția de științe Istorice și Institutul de Istorie din București. Studii. Revistă de Istorie*, 12 (1959), 257-266, esp. 262-265.

¹² "Ὁ Κύριος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης Ὑάκινθος (1345-6) καὶ ὁ ῥόλος του εἰς τὸν ἀντιπαραλαμνικὸν ἀγῶνα," *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαί*, 25 (1961), 89-122, esp. 109-122.

¹³ On the contrary, many passages of Cabasilas can be meaningfully juxtaposed with

In the commentary to the edition of the *Discourse*, I claimed that my main point was sufficiently and safely established. As for my main suggestion (Apocaucus as the adversary, date: 1344), I was careful to observe that it was based on speculation, that it was probable, and that it was offered to provoke discussion rather than to end it (pp. 161 and 170). Thus I anticipated general agreement on the main point, and expected objections to the dating. The opposite occurred. The critics, who insist on having the *Discourse* written between 1342 and 1349, accepted my problematical dating expressly,¹⁷ by implication, or with a slight modification,¹⁸ but rejected or qualified my main point.

One noteworthy objection by E. Frances¹⁹ derives its strength from the dating of the *Discourse* in 1344. Since young Cabasilas, as Frances quite rightly observes, certainly was in Thessalonica in the summer of 1345 and most likely stayed there until 1347, it is, I grant, quite probable that he was in Thessalonica in 1344 as well. That he must, therefore, have written his *Discourse* there against the Zealots is a *non sequitur*, but such an assumption would be quite plausible, if the text of the *Discourse* warranted it and if we really knew that this text was written in 1344.

Only Father Dennis²⁰ reacted to the edition of the *Discourse* in accordance with my expectations. He accepted my main conclusion, but very tentatively proposed Manuel II as one of Cabasilas' adversaries, and advanced the period after 1371 as a possible date for the *Discourse*. This remark coincides with a suggestion I made in 1960, on different grounds, which will be mentioned in the second part of this note. All those interested in the Zealot

problem look forward to learning more about Father Dennis' arguments.²¹

No new source, or valid new interpretation of a hitherto known source, has been introduced by those critics who insist on connecting Cabasilas' *Discourse* with the Zealots. The only two new pieces of evidence which constitute parallels to Cabasilas' text appeared in the work by Father Dennis. Both occur in an as yet unpublished homily of Isidore, metropolitan of Thessalonica (1380–1384; 1386–1396). In the first passage the Metropolitan opposes secularization measures undertaken by Manuel II's officials in order to provide sustenance for warriors. If this is done, God's help will be withdrawn from the Byzantines in their distress: ὅταν δὲ καὶ τὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων ἀφαιρῶμεν εὐεργέτου, αὐτὰ λέγω τὰ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ προσγραφέντα οἴκοις, καὶ ἰσχυροὶ γενέσθαι νομίζωμεν ὅτι μαχίμοις ταῦτα συγχωροῦμεν κατεσθίειν ἀνδράσι, ποίας ἂν τῆς παρὰ θεοῦ ῥοπῆς εὐπορήσῃμεν ἐν ἀνάγκαις;²²

In the second passage, following closely upon the first, and published long ago by Sp. Lampros, Isidore observes that confiscation of inalienable ecclesiastical property in order to provide assistance for oneself by offering sustenance to others (meaning the same μάχιμοι ἄνδρες who have been mentioned in the first passage) is suicidal action: εἰ γὰρ ἃ τηρεῖν ἄψανστά σοι προσήκε, τὰ θεῖα φημί ἀναθήματα, ταῦτα ὑπὲρ σῆς ἀφαιρῶν βοηθείας, ὡς φῆς, ἄλλοις εἰς τράπεζαν παρασκευάζεις, παραπλήσιόν τι ποιεῖς, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ἱατρὸς φάρμακον, ὃ καὶ τὸν ἀψάμενον χειρὶ καὶ τὸν γευσάμενον θανατοῖ, τοῦτο οἰκείαις χερσὶν εἰληφὼς τοῖς κάμνουσιν ὥρεγεν.²³ This Isidore is forced to say on account of people who urge the Emperor (Manuel II) to lay hands on Church property

¹⁷ E. Werner, "Volkstümliche Häretiker..." (as in note 10 *supra*), 57, note 117.

¹⁸ K. P. Kyrrhis, "Ὁ Κύπριος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος..." (as in note 12 *supra*), 110 (date of the *Discourse*: 1346–1347). Cf. *ibidem*, 109, for an argument which would surely eliminate the date of 1344, if Hyacinthus was one of Cabasilas' adversaries, if the *Discourse* was written in Thessalonica, and if, as seems probable, Hyacinthus arrived in Thessalonica as late as 1345.

¹⁹ "Răscăla..." (as in note 11 *supra*), 263.

²⁰ *The Reign of Manuel II...* (as in note 5 *supra*), 90, 91 and note 30.

²¹ In his review, P. Charanis was quick to perceive the implications of Dennis' remark, and said that a later date of the *Discourse* would "make [better] sense." Cf. *Speculum*, 36 (1961), 476–477.

²² Excerpt taken over from Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II...* (as in note 5 *supra*), 89, note 25, where it is quoted from *Vaticanus Graecus* 651, fol. 40v.

²³ Excerpt printed in Sp. Lampros, "Ἰσιδώρου μητροπολίτου Θεσσαλονίκης ὁκτώ ἐπιστολαὶ ἀνέκδοτοι," *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων*, 9 (1912), 350.

(μετακινεῖν τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν). The Emperor is pious; he indicated that the property of Ἅγιος Σώζων belonging to "our" Church should remain with "us," although many dignitaries (τῶν ἐν ἀξίαις προϋχόντων) were of a different opinion. The Emperor did not accomplish his purpose according to his wishes (thus the secularization did take place?), compelled as he was by the current situation (the siege of Thessalonica by the Turks).²⁴

The homily of Isidore from which these passages have been quoted dates from late 1383 or early 1384. By themselves, the passages do not indicate that Cabasilas' *Discourse* was written about that time. But they do provide a literary parallel, whose meaning is quite clear, to the attacks of Cabasilas on his anonymous lay adversaries. Isidore's words are an additional argument for identifying these adversaries with governmental officials secularizing monastic property for defense needs.^{24a}

²⁴ This summary is based on the text in Lampros (as in the preceding note), 350–351. The passage summed up is translated in Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II*... (as in note 5 *supra*), 89–90.

^{24a} The passages quoted are not the only ones in which Isidore inveighs against those who secularize ecclesiastical property under external pressure. A superficial scanning of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 651 revealed two more such passages in the very first homily (On Luke 8:27; date: 1381–1384). Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 12^v: εἰ γοῦν ἀδικουμένοις βοηθήσομεν, πένησι, τὰ κατὰ χρεῖαν χορηγήσομεν, τῇ πνευματικῇ ἀλλήλους ἀγάπῃ συνδήσομεν, τὸ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κεχρεωσθημένον σέβας ἀνόθευτον τηρήσομεν, τὰ ἀλλότρια διαρπάζειν ἔασομεν, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν οἴκων, δι' ἃ καὶ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγανάκτησις καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιτείνεται καὶ οἱ ἀσεβεῖς τὰ ἡμέτερα διαρπάζουσιν – εἰ τοίνυν μεθ' ὧν ἔφην πρὸ πάντων τὰ τῶν θείων ναῶν ἀναθήματα τοῖς τούτων δεσπότηαις ἀδελφικῶς συγχωρήσομεν, κἀνταῦθα μὲν θεοῦ συναιρομένου τὰ οἰκεία παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν κοιμούμεθα, ἐν δὲ τῷ μέλλοντι καὶ τὸ ὠραιότατον ἐκεῖνο οἶκμα, τὸν παρόδεισον, ἀποληψόμεθα. εἰπὲ γάρ μοι· πότε τῶν ἐπιφορῶν ὄψεσθαι τὴν λύσιν ἐλπίζεις, μήτ' ἀποδιδούς τὰ ἀρπαγέντα, καὶ τοιαῦτα συλλέγων ἕτερα; εἰ μὲν γὰρ κατέθου τὸ ἀδίκημα καὶ τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν πέπαυσαι, καὶ σοὶ τὴν συγγνώμην τυχὼν ὁ θεὸς παρέξει καὶ ἀναλαβεῖν παρασκευάσει τὰ ἀπολωλότα· εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν κατέχεις καὶ ἄλλην προστιθεῖναι σπεύδεις, οὐκ οἶδα ἂν πότε τοῦ θεοῦ τύχοιμεν εὐμενοῦς. Cf. further *ibidem*, fols. 14^v–15^r: τί δαί, ὅταν καὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων ἐφάπτη τῶν ἱερῶν; τοῦ θεοῦ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἅπαντα, ὡς ἦδη φθάσαντες ἐδηλώσαμεν· ἃ δὲ τὰ θεία φέρουσι τεμένη, κατ' ἐξάρητον ἔχει

II

In *DOP*, 14 (1960), 179–201, I discussed the *Parisinus Graecus* 1276, a miscellaneous manuscript written by various hands, that once belonged to Arsenius of Monembasia (1465–1535). This manuscript contains an earlier and shorter version of the *Discourse*—I called it "First Version"—with additions (marginal, interlinear, or inserted in a separate quire) by other hands. These additions are incorporated into the main text of the full—I called it "Third"—version of the *Discourse*, known through other manuscripts, such as *Parisinus Graecus* 1213. A routine check with the tables of H. Omont²⁵ indicated that neither the scribe of the main text of the First Version (= hand A), nor the author of the main additions (= hand A²) exhibited a *ductus* especially similar to that of Arsenius. I concluded that *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 was a draft of what I called the Second Version of the *Discourse* (a version very close to, but not identical with, the full, or Third, version known through other manuscripts) and that the chief among the several correctors' hands was that of Cabasilas himself.

The First Version (with traces of an even earlier stage) is written on paper bearing watermarks attested in the last thirty years of the fourteenth century. I deduced that Cabasilas must have prepared the later versions within that time-span and therefore long after the Zealot revolution. I stated that Cabasilas may have been reacting to the governmental secularization of monastic property after the battle of Maritza and that a date later than 1371 for the whole *Discourse* was possible (p. 188).

τὴν εἰς θεὸν οἰκείωσιν. καθάπερ γὰρ τοῦ βασιλέως μὲν ἅπαντα τὰ τῶν ὑπὸ χεῖρα, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν σῶζει τοῖς ἐξωθεν λόγον τὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ πρὸς λειτουργίαν ἀφωσιωμένα, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἰδιωτικὰ καὶ ἱερὰ τὴν ἴσιν ἔχει τάξιν, οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑφέξουσι δίκην οἱ κατ' ἀμφοτέρων ἐξυβρικότες, ἀλλ' ὅσον τὸ μέσον ἰδιωτικοῦ πρὸς ἱερὸν, τοσοῦτον ὑπερβάλλον ἰδιωτικοῦ τὸ κατὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τόλμημα. – ἀλλ' ἀνάγκης μοι, φησίν, ἐπιστάσης, ἡψάμην καὶ τῶν τοιούτων. – τί λέγεις; οὐκοῦν ἀρνήσῃ καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀνάγκης ἐπιταττούσης; ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τοῦτο ἀθέμιτον, οὕτω κἀκεῖνο παράνομον. The *Vaticanus Graecus* 651 deserves closer scrutiny.

²⁵ *Fac-similés de manuscrits grecs des XV^e et XVI^e siècles... d'après les originaux de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (1887), pls. 5–6.

However, one apparent difficulty emerged. It was offered in 1961 by M. I. Manousakas²⁶ excellent edition of the letters of Arsenius of Monembasia. A facsimile of Arsenius' autographs, inserted between pages 8 and 9 of the article, showed similarities at least with the hand A², that of the main marginal and interlinear corrector of *Parisinus Graecus* 1276. In oral communication, the editor kindly drew my attention to these similarities. *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 did belong to Arsenius of Monembasia. Was Arsenius the scribe A², that is, the author of the main marginal and interlinear additions, which he had culled from some manuscript of the Second Version accessible to him? At first I was puzzled, for I knew that I, for one, was not immune to making an error of a hundred years in dating a late Byzantine hand. After some reflection, I decided against attributing the corrections by hand A² (let alone the main text of the First Version by hand A) to Arsenius. I did so for a number of reasons, four of which will be mentioned here:

1. The *ductus* of letters δ, ρ, φ by hands A² and A in *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 is different from that of Arsenius.^{26a}

2. If hand A² of *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 is Arsenius', and if he had a manuscript similar to *Parisinus Graecus* 1213 (the Third Version of the *Discourse*) before his eyes while making his corrections, how is one to explain the fact that, instead of writing what he saw there, for example, τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων πραγμάτων, δι' ᾧ μισεῖται καὶ πολεμεῖται, ἣ τῶν ἰδίων ἔνεκα (*Discourse*, 28, 1–3), he wrote (fol. 75^v) ἣ τῶν ἰδίων ἣ τῶν κοινῶν ἔνεκα τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων πραγμάτων δι' ᾧ (the rest of the line is illegible) then interchanged the places of ἣ τῶν ἰδίων – ἔνεκα and τῶν αὐτῶν etc., crossed out ἣ τῶν κοινῶν ἔνεκα and replaced these words by ἔνεκα alone, thus finally obtaining the text which we read in *Parisinus Graecus* 1213? These seem to me to be an author's, rather than a collator's, procedures (cf. fig. 3 of my article in *DOP*, 14 [1960]; for other examples, cf. *ibidem*, 183–184).

²⁶ "'Ἀρσενίου Μονεμβασίας τοῦ Ἀποστόλη ἐπιστολαὶ ἀνέκδοτοι (1521–1534) . . .," Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου, 8/9 (1958/9), but printed in 1961.

^{26a} In particular, Arsenius does not use the uncial *delta*, frequent in A and A².

3. If hand A of *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 were identical with that of Arsenius, it would be difficult to explain why he wrote on paper which, by the time of his writing, must have been about one hundred years old. The only reasonable way out of this difficulty would be to show that Professor Irigoin's and my own dating of the watermarks on the pages written by hand A is erroneous.

4. But if hand A were identical with that of Arsenius, it would be even more difficult to account for his behavior on fol. 65^v of *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 (in the area of what I call the earliest stage). There, scribe A crossed out eight and a half final lines of the main text, and continued on fol. 66^r (again in the main text) with twelve lines which are an expanded variant of the deleted passage, a variant virtually identical with what we now read in *Parisinus Graecus* 1213 (cf. *DOP*, 14 [1960], 183 and 191). Where would Arsenius have got his inspiration for the preceeding eight and a half lines? Fols. 65^v–66^r of *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 reflect an author's, not a collator's, changes.

I am willing to reconsider these arguments if new evidence is brought forward. For the time being, however, I am unable to explain the situation in *Parisinus Graecus* 1276 on the assumption that scribes A or A² (or both) are identical with Arsenius.^{26b} The only words of the First Version of the *Discourse* quite likely to have been written by him are those of the title on fol. 65^r: πρὸς τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις.

In concluding, I wish to sum up my position in clear terms:

1. The Zealot movement was an important social revolt; hence, obviously a part of the popular masses—say one or two thousand strong in Thessalonica alone—took an active part in it.

2. Cabasilas' *Discourse* does not deal with a specific Zealot program. After the publication of the *Discourse*'s full text, this should be καὶ τυφλῷ δῆλον. I even contend that the *Discourse* does not deal with the Zealots at all.

3. Exactly when, where, and against whom the *Discourse* was written, I do not know.

^{26b} On the basis of materials at his disposal, Professor Alexander Turyn pronounced himself against the identification of Arsenius with hands A or A² (written communication).

Parisinus Graecus 1276 suggests, without making it mandatory, that the *Discourse* was written in the last thirty years of the fourteenth century.

4. Quoting and occasionally misunderstanding well-known sources and invoking general sociological laws will not contribute to the solution of the concrete problems posed by Cabasilas' *Discourse*. I heartily agree with Mrs. Hrochová²⁷ that our foremost task in the study of the Zealot movement, and of the social unrest of the fourteenth century in general,²⁸ lies in the continuous search for new sources. By editing Cabasilas and Macrembolites,²⁹ I attempted to fulfill a part of this task.³⁰

²⁷ *Československý časopis Historický*, 7 (1959), 372; *Byzantinoslavica*, 22 (1961), 15.

²⁸ In this connection, I want to draw attention to the edition of Isidore of Thessalonica's five Homilies by B. Laourdas, 'Ἰσιδώρου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης ὁμιλίας εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου (1954) [= 'Ελληνικά, Παράρτημα 5]. Homilies four and five (pp. 55–60 and 60–65) contain numerous allusions to social discontent in Thessalonica in 1393. Thus on pages 64,38–65,1 and 65,13 we read clear references to the officials' apprehending possible direct action against them by the dissatisfied people.

²⁹ *Srpska Akademija Nauka, Zbornik Radova*, 65 (1960), 187–228. Cf. the qualified approval by A. P. Každan, *Voprosy Istorii* (October 1960), 193–194: some of my opinions are said to be unfounded, but the edition itself is commended.

5. Therefore, until the appearance of arguments based either on new sources, or on hitherto disregarded old ones, I shall abstain from further discussion, *μεγάλα χαίρειν εἰπὼν* to Cabasilas' *Discourse*.

³⁰ This *Postscript* was already in proof when I obtained the valuable work by B. T. Gorjanov, *Pozdne-vizantijskij feodalizm* (1962). Pages 310–318 and 331–332 of the book discuss—in part benevolently, but more often critically—the publication of Cabasilas' *Discourse* and of Macrembolites' *Dialogue*. I thank the author for his compliments (pp. 310, 316); I am sorry that "scholars of [my] kind" should have created the impression of engaging in a deliberate falsification of history (p. 332). Judging by Mr. Gorjanov's summaries of my argument, his English must have failed him on occasion, for I never made several of the points (including the purportedly main one) which he either attributes to me or refutes with great ease and without the help of source quotations. My arguments have not shaken the author's belief that Cabasilas' *Discourse* deals with the Zealot movement (p. 314); he therefore uses this document to reconstruct what he calls the socio-economic and political reforms of the Zealots (p. 355ff.). At the present stage of publication (page proofs) of this *Postscript*, this is all I can say concerning Mr. Gorjanov's position. All is not lost, however, since he promises to return to my first two publications on another occasion (pp. 310, 318). I shall be happy to answer him at leisure, provided the conditions set up in point five at the end of this *Postscript* permit me to do so.